

Application No. 09/467,851  
Amendment "A" dated April 22, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed March 29, 2004

### REMARKS


The first Office Action, mailed March 29, 2004, considered claims 1-22. Claims 1, 15 and 18 were rejected as being unpatentable under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1, 12, 23 and 32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,460,180 (Park). Claims 1, 15 and 18 were rejected as being unpatentable under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1, 2, 16 and 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,668,378 (Leak).

Terminal disclaimers are being filed with this paper, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c), to overcome the aforementioned non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejections in view of Park and Leak. Accordingly, inasmuch as there are no other objections or rejections to the pending claims or application, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending application is now in condition for prompt allowance.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 22 day of April 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
JENS C. JENKINS  
Registration No. 44,803  
Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

RDN:JCJ:cm  
CM0000003643V001